

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

**1. Rejection of claims 1-4, 7-9, 12-15, 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art in view of Van Elp et al. (US 6,864,957):**

5

**Claim 1:**

Claim 1 is listed hereinafter for reference:

"Claim 1 A wafer carrier for carrying a wafer, comprising:

a transparent base;

10 a conducting layer positioned on a bottom surface of the transparent base; and

a bonding layer positioned on a top surface of the wafer carrier for bonding the wafer and the transparent base together;

wherein the conducting layer of the wafer carrier is attracted to an electrostatic chuck via electrostatic force."

15

In the instant Office Action, the Examiner states that AAPA teaches using a transparent base 28. However, **AAPA teaches using a wafer carrier, which is bare wafer ([para 7]), and AAPA also points out that the carrier wafer of the conventional method does not allow performing the alignment action ([para 8]). Therefore, it is impossible for the wafer carrier to be transparent.**

20

Also, the Examiner states that Van Elp teaches using a transparent conducting layer 321. ***As a matter of fact, the element 321 of Van Elp is a dielectric member (col. 11, line 43), not a conducting layer.***

25

Therefore, AAPA and Van Elp fail to teach all the limitations of claim 1, and thus claim 1 should be allowed. Reconsideration of claim 1 is politely requested.

Claim 3:

Claim 3 teaches using a glass wafer as the transparent base. AAPA fails to teach using a transparent base, not to mention a glass wafer. Therefore, claim 3 should be allowed, and reconsideration of claim 3 is politely requested.

5

Claim 4:

Claim 4 teaches using a quartz wafer as the transparent base. AAPA fails to teach using a transparent base, not to mention a quartz wafer. Therefore, claim 4 should be allowed, and reconsideration of claim 4 is politely requested.

10

Claim 9:

Claim 9 teaches that the conducting layer is a transparent conducting layer. Van Elp teaches a **dielectric** member 321, which is **not conductive**. Also, Van Elp does not disclose whether it is transparent or not. Even though the dielectric member 321 is transparent, it is not conductive. The dielectric member 321 is patentably distinct from the transparent conducting layer of claim 9. Therefore, claim 9 should be allowed, and reconsideration of claim 9 is politely requested.

15

Claim 2 and 7-8:

Claims 2 and 7-8 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable. Reconsideration of claims 2 and 7-8 is therefore requested.

20

Claim 12:

Claim 12 is listed hereinafter for reference:

“Claim 12 A wafer carrier adapted for use in a double-sided process for carrying a wafer, comprising:

25

a transparent base;

a conducting layer positioned on a bottom surface of the transparent base, wherein

the conducting layer of the wafer carrier is attracted to an electrostatic chuck via electrostatic force; and  
a bonding layer positioned on a top surface of the transparent base for bonding the wafer and the transparent base.”

5

In the instant Office Action, the Examiner states that AAPA teaches using a transparent base 28. However, **AAPA teaches using a wafer carrier, which is bare wafer ([para 7]), and AAPA also points out that the carrier wafer of the conventional method does not allow performing the alignment action ([para 8]).**  
**Therefore, it is impossible for the wafer carrier to be transparent.**

10

Also, the Examiner states that Van Elp teaches using a transparent conducting layer 321. **As a matter of fact, the element 321 of Van Elp is a dielectric member (col. 11, line 43), not a conducting layer.**

15

Therefore, AAPA and Van Elp fail to teach all the limitations of claim 12, and thus claim 12 should be allowed. Reconsideration of claim 12 is politely requested.

Claim 14:

20

Claim 14 teaches using a glass wafer as the transparent base. **AAPA fails to teach using a transparent base, not to mention a glass wafer.** Therefore, claim 14 should be allowed, and reconsideration of claim 14 is politely requested.

Claim 15:

25

Claim 15 teaches using a quartz wafer as the transparent base. **AAPA fails to teach using a transparent base, not to mention a quartz wafer.** Therefore, claim 15 should be allowed, and reconsideration of claim 15 is politely requested.

Claim 13 and 17-18:

Claims 13 and 17-18 are dependent on claim 12, and should be allowed if claim 12 is found allowable. Reconsideration of claims 13 and 17-18 is therefore requested.

- 5     **2. Rejection of claims 6 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Van Elp et al. (US 6,864,957) and further in view of Strasbaugh et al. (US 2003/0134578):**

Claim 6:

- 10     Claim 6 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable. Reconsideration of claim 6 is therefore requested.

Claim 16:

- 15     Claim 16 is dependent on claim 12, and should be allowed if claim 12 is found allowable. Reconsideration of claim 16 is therefore requested.

**3. Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 10-11:

- 20     Claims 10-11 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable.

Claims 20-21:

- 25     Claims 20-21 is dependent on claim 12, and should be allowed if claim 12 is found allowable.

**4. Unexamined claim 19:**

Claim 19:

Appl. No. 10/711,882  
Amdt. dated August 13, 2008  
Reply to Office action of May 16, 2008

Claim 19 teaches that the conducting layer is a transparent conducting layer. Van Elp teaches a dielectric member 321, which is **not conductive**, and Van Elp does not disclose whether it is transparent or not. Therefore, claim 19 should be allowed, and reconsideration of claim 19 is politely requested.

5

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Sincerely yours,

10



Date: 08.13.2008

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

15

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)

20